UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,032	12/22/2005	William M. Shvodian	XSI.089US/10X-254US	5465

51204 7590 12/18/2008

POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC
12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE, SUITE 101
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
POGMORE, TRAVIS D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4148	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/562,032	SHVODIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Travis Pogmore	4148	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 December 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12 August 2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed November 18, 2008.

2. Claims 1-24 are currently pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19 and 22 are currently amended and claims 23-24 have been previously presented.

3. Applicant's arguments, with regards to claims 1, 10, 19, and 22, filed November 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner Notes

4. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. As required by M.P.E.P. 609, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statement dated August 12, 2008 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending.

Claim Objections

6. Applicant's arguments, see page 10, and respective amendments filed 18 November 2008, with respect to the informality of claim 22 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claim 22 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-14, 16, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WIPO Publication WO 02/09331 A2 (hereinafter "Lockridge et al.").

As to claim 1, Lockridge et al. teaches a method of time stamping data in a local wireless device (page 16, lines 29-31, 802.11b is an example of a local wireless network and thus Lockridge teaches a local wireless device), comprising:

sequentially detecting a plurality of global synchronizing events, each of the global synchronizing events being associated with one of a plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers (page 5, lines 13-28, a System Clock Recovery signal sent out by the head end is a global synchronizing event as its timing information is propagated throughout the system and since the input may be in transport packets (plural) it must necessarily come in a sequence of some sort and in order for the server

to frequency lock its own local system clock to the head end system it must necessarily be able to detect the global synchronizing events, an 802.11 beacon providing a BSSID (i.e. a global synchronizing event identifier) along with its timestamp);

receiving host data from a local host circuit (Fig. 4 as briefly described on page 12, lines 8-15);

forming the host data into data packets, each of the data packets including time stamp information, the time stamp information indicating when a selected one of the data packets should be processed by a remote receiver relative to other of the data packets (page 5, lines 19-32, since the server is frequency locked to the head end system time stamp T1 is a time stamp which ensures that any client device may reproduce the arrival time, even if the global synchronizing event itself is not forwarded to it); and

transmitting the data packets over a wireless channel to a remote wireless device, wherein the time stamp information is identified relative to one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with one of the plurality of global synchronizing events (page 5, lines 23-32, the server may be frequency-locked to the head end (particular 802.11 beacon initiator) system clock and thus the time stamp T1 is relative to the global synchronizing event identifier).

As to claim 2, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the global synchronizing events are one of: a plurality of network beacons sent over a wireless channel by a network coordinator, a plurality of network beacons generated by the local wireless device, a

plurality of global positioning system signals sent over a wireless channel, a plurality of synchronization packets sent over a wireless channel by a remote network device, a plurality of synchronization packets generated by the local wireless device, and a plurality of synchronization signals sent over a wired channel (page 5, lines 12-18, a System Clock Recovery could be a network beacon, a synchronization packet or a synchronization signal, and sent by wired or wireless channels).

As to claim 3, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the data packets include two or more levels of encapsulation (page 7, lines 13-16, TCP or UDP is one level of encapsulation and IP is a second level).

As to claim 4, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the time stamp information includes first and second time stamp markers, the first time stamp marker being in a first of the two or more levels of encapsulation, and the second time stamp marker being in a second of the two or more levels of encapsulation (page 7, lines 21-22 and page 8, lines 12-13, time stamp T1 is placed in the UDP payload making the application layer the first level of encapsulation and T2 is placed outside of the UDP data making the transport layer the second level of encapsulation).

As to claim 5, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the first time stamp marker comprises a first free-running timer value corresponding to the host data, and wherein the second time stamp marker comprises one of the plurality of different global

synchronizing event identifiers associated with the one of the plurality of global synchronizing events and a second free-running timer value corresponding to the global synchronizing event (page 5, line 32 through page 6, line 7, the local system clock of the server used for time stamp T2 being the first free-running timer and time stamp T1 being from the same free-running timer but as the server is frequency-locked via the SCR from the head end system clock (as it is added before any additional processing is done) being the second time stamp, and an 802.11 beacon frame in an ad-hoc network retransmitting the received BSSID (global synchronizing event identifier) along with the head end system clock time stamp to ensure synchronization for the appropriate network).

As to claim 7, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the method is embodied in an integrated circuit (page 12, lines 11-15, and Figure 4, element 404 and Figure 9).

As to claim 9, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the host data comprises one of: MPEG cells, encapsulated MPEG cells, Ethernet packets, internet protocol packets, and PCM audio samples (page 7, lines 12-16, disclosed are Ethernet packets and internet protocol packets comprising multi-media content in general).

As to claim 10, Lockridge et al. teaches a method of coordinating data in a wireless receiver (page 16, lines 29-31), comprising:

sequentially detecting a plurality of global synchronizing events, each of the global synchronizing events being associated with one of a plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers (page 5, lines 13-28, a System Clock Recovery signal sent out by the head end is a global synchronizing event as its timing information is propagated throughout the system and since the input may be in transport packets (plural) it must necessarily come in a sequence of some sort and in order for the server to frequency lock its own local system clock to the head end system it must necessarily be able to detect the global synchronizing events, an 802.11 beacon providing a BSSID (i.e. a global synchronizing event identifier) along with its timestamp);

receiving a data packet from a remote device over a wireless channel (Fig. 2, element 203);

extracting time stamp information from the data packet, the time stamp information indicating when the received data packet should be processed by the wireless receiver relative to other data packets (page 13, lines 21-23, the clock recovery algorithm teaches the relative processing of the packets based on their respective timestamps);

extracting host data from the data packet (page 13, lines 16-18); and

passing the host data to a local host in response to the time stamp information, wherein the time stamp information is identified relative to one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with one of the plurality of global synchronizing events (page 13, lines 21-23 and page 5, lines 23-32, the server may be

frequency-locked to the head end (particular 802.11 beacon initiator) system clock and thus the time stamp T1 is relative to the global synchronizing event identifier).

As to claim 11, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the global synchronizing events are one of: a plurality of network beacons sent over a wireless channel by a network coordinator, a plurality of network beacons generated by the local wireless device, a plurality of global positioning system signals sent over a wireless channel, a plurality of synchronization packets sent over a wireless channel by a remote network device, a plurality of synchronization packets generated by the local wireless device, and a plurality of synchronization signals sent over a wired channel (page 5, lines 12-18, a System Clock Recovery could be a network beacon, a synchronization packet or a synchronization signal, and sent by wired or wireless channels).

As to claim 12, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the data packets include two or more levels of encapsulation (page 7, lines 12-16, disclosed are Ethernet packets and internet protocol packets comprising multi-media content in general).

As to claim 13, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the time stamp information includes first and second time stamp markers, the first time stamp marker being in a first of the two or more levels of encapsulation, and the second time stamp marker being in a second of the two or more levels of encapsulation (page 7, lines 21-22 and page 8, lines 12-13).

As to claim 14, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the first time stamp marker comprises a first free-running timer value corresponding to the host data, and wherein the second time stamp marker comprises one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with the one of the plurality of global synchronizing events and a second free-running timer value corresponding to the global synchronizing event (page 5, line 32 through page 6, line 2 and page 6, lines 5-7, and an 802.11 beacon frame in an ad-hoc network retransmitting the received BSSID (global synchronizing event identifier) along with the head end system clock time stamp to ensure synchronization for the appropriate network).

As to claim 16, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the method is embodied in an integrated circuit (page 12, lines 11-15).

As to claim 18, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the host data comprises one of: MPEG cells, encapsulated MPEG cells, Ethernet packets, internet protocol packets, and PCM audio samples (page 7, lines 12-16).

As to claim 19, Lockridge et al. teaches a device for transmitting host data (Fig. 2, reference 202), comprising:

a free-running timer for providing a series of increasing free-running timing values (Fig. 2, reference T1);

a host interface circuit for receiving host data from a local host circuit and a first free- running timing value from the series of increasing free-running timing values, and for placing the host data and the first free-running timing value into a host interface packet (page 5, line 29 – page 6, line 2, the data packet must be on a local host circuit once it is received and then it is stamped and broadcast together with T1 (which is a local system clock, by definition a free-running timer));

a detection circuit for detecting a global synchronizing event the global synchronizing events being associated with one of a plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers (page 5, lines 13-28, a System Clock Recovery signal sent out by the head end is a global synchronizing event as its timing information is propagated throughout the system and since the input may be in transport packets (plural) it must necessarily come in a sequence of some sort and in order for the server to frequency lock its own local system clock to the head end system it must necessarily be able to detect the global synchronizing events, an 802.11 beacon providing a BSSID (i.e. a global synchronizing event identifier) along with its timestamp) and receiving a second free-running timing value from the series of increasing free-running timing values (page 6, lines 5-7, the same local system clock as was used for time stamp T1 is sampled again to generate T2); and

a wireless transceiver for adding the second free-running timing value and the one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with the global synchronizing event to the host interface packet to form an air link frame, and transmitting the air link frame over a wireless channel to a remote wireless device (page

6, lines 7-14 in light of page 16, lines 29-31, the data frame includes the first time stamp T1 which is offset from the global synchronizing event and the second time stamp T2 and is received by the client device, and since 802.11b is an example of a local wireless network Lockridge teaches a local wireless device which by necessity has a transceiver capable of transmitting the data frame as an air link frame; an 802.11 frame in an ad-hoc network retransmitting the received BSSID (global synchronizing event identifier) to ensure synchronization to the appropriate network).

As to claim 20, Lockridge et al. teaches further comprising a first-in-first-out buffer located between the host interface circuit and the wireless transceiver for passing the host interface packet (Fig. 5, element 512 and page 6, lines 1-2, this is a more detailed view of Fig. 4 which is a more detailed view of the server (Fig. 2, element 202); first the data is received by the satellite tuner (Fig. 5, element 502) and then it travels through elements 504 and 506 (comprising the host interface circuit) and continuing on through the rest of Fig. 5 (including the FIFO buffer) before moving on to the Ethernet time stamp board (Fig. 4, element 404) where time stamp T1 is added to the packet before it is broadcast (that being the point at which it must reach the wireless transceiver)).

As to claim 21, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the global synchronizing event is one of: a network beacon sent over a wireless channel by a network coordinator, a network beacon generated by the wireless transceiver, a global positioning system

signal sent over a wireless channel, a synchronization packet sent over a wireless channel by a remote network device, a synchronization packet generated by the wireless transceiver, and a synchronization signal sent over a wired channel (page 5, lines 12-18, a System Clock Recovery could be a network beacon, a synchronization packet or a synchronization signal, and sent by wired or wireless channels).

As to claim 22, Lockridge et al. teaches a receiver device for receiving host data over a wireless channel, comprising:

a free-running timer for providing a series of increasing free-running timing values (page 6, lines 17-19);

a detection circuit for detecting a global synchronizing event and receiving a free-running timing value from the series of increasing free-running timing values (page 5, lines 18-22 and page 6, lines 5-7);

a wireless transceiver for receiving an air link frame having a host interface packet and a first time stamp, the host interface packet including a second time stamp (page 13, lines 10-15 and Fig.6, element 602, since the network may be wireless as previously established it is inherent in the art that any client in the network must have a wireless transceiver and the packet received by the time stamp board may include both T1 and T2);

a first time stamp processor for receiving the first time stamp and comparing the first time stamp with a recorded free-running timing value to determine a timer correction value for the receiver device; (page 13, lines 21-26);

a second time stamp processor for receiving the second time stamp and generating a host data process signal based on the second time stamp, the correction value, and a latency value, the latency value indicating an expected maximum latency time for the air link frame over the wireless channel (page 13, lines 21-26, the second time stamp processor is not patentably distinct from the first time stamp processor, Figures 2 and 6 and the disclosure in the instant application by only containing a single time stamp processor); and

a host interface circuit for receiving and processing the host interface frame based on the host data process signal, and providing the host data to a local host circuit (Figure 6 and page 13, lines 13-20).

As to claim 23, Lockridge et al. teaches further comprising a first-in-first-out buffer located between the wireless transceiver and the host interface circuit for passing the host interface packet. (page 6, line 26 through page 7 line 1, in order for the buffer to remove data at the same rate they arrived at the server it must be a FIFO buffer).

As to claim 24, Lockridge et al. teaches wherein the global synchronizing event is one of: a network beacon sent over a wireless channel by a network coordinator, a network beacon generated by the wireless transceiver, a global positioning system signal sent over a wireless channel, a synchronization packet sent over a wireless channel by a remote network device, a synchronization packet generated by the wireless transceiver, and a synchronization signal sent over a wired channel (page 5,

lines 12-18, a System Clock Recovery could be a network beacon, a synchronization packet or a synchronization signal, and sent by wired or wireless channels).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lockridge et al. in view of WIPO Application Publication Number WO 01/52461 A2 (hereinafter "Tan et al.").

As to claim 6, Lockridge et al. teaches the method of time stamping data as recited in claim 1, but does not specifically teach wherein the time stamp information comprises the one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with the one of the plurality of global synchronizing events and an offset timing value relating the host data in time with respect to the global synchronizing event.

However, Tan et al. teaches wherein the time stamp information comprises the one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with the one of the plurality of global synchronizing events and an offset timing value relating the host data in time with respect to the global synchronizing event (page 6, lines 8-14 and page 12, lines 9-14, a beacon transmission is a global synchronizing event (with

information in the A-field comprising the global synchronizing event identifier) and in order to synchronize other devices besides the server with said beacon transmission there must necessarily be an offset provided (e.g. by comparing T2 relative to T1)).

Since the devices disclosed in Tan et al. are mobile in nature unlike those in Lockridge, and the primary purpose of the system disclosed in Tan et al. is synchronization, it is necessary that an offset timing value be used in order to actually provide synchronization.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lockridge et al. to include the ability to process the time stamp information comprising a global synchronizing event identifier and an offset timing value as in Tan et al. because it would provide with an improved system wherein mobile devices could be synchronized, not just stationary ones.

As to claim 15, Lockridge et al. teaches the method of coordinating data as recited in claim 10, but does not specifically teach wherein the time stamp information comprises the one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with the one of the plurality of global synchronizing events and an offset timing value relating the host data in time with respect to the global synchronizing event.

However, Tan et al. teaches wherein the time stamp information comprises the one of the plurality of different global synchronizing event identifiers associated with the one of the plurality of global synchronizing events and an offset timing value relating the host data in time with respect to the global synchronizing event (page 6, lines 8-14 and

page 12, lines 9-14, a beacon transmission is a global synchronizing event (with information in the A-field comprising the global synchronizing event identifier) and in order to synchronize other devices besides the server with said beacon transmission there must necessarily be an offset provided (e.g. by comparing T2 relative to T1)).

Since the devices disclosed in Tan et al. are mobile in nature unlike those in Lockridge, and the primary purpose of the system disclosed in Tan et al. is synchronization, it is necessary that an offset timing value be used in order to actually provide synchronization.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lockridge et al. to include the ability to process the time stamp information comprising a global synchronizing event identifier and an offset timing value as in Tan et al. because it would provide with an improved system wherein mobile devices could be synchronized, not just stationary ones.

11. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lockridge et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,995,534 (hereinafter "Fullerton").

As to claim 8, Lockridge et al. teaches the method of time stamping data as recited in claim 1, but does not specifically teach wherein the method is embodied in an ultrawide bandwidth transceiver.

However, Fullerton teaches an ultrawide bandwidth communication system and method (column 2, lines 10-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lockridge et al. to include utilizing an ultrawide bandwidth transceiver as in Fullerton because it would provide with an improved system wherein an impulse radio link can communicate many independent channels simultaneously by employing different subcarriers for each channel (Fullerton, Abstract, lines 1-11).

As to claim 15, Lockridge et al. teaches the method of coordinating data as recited in claim 10, but does not specifically teach wherein the method is embodied in an ultrawide bandwidth transceiver.

However, Fullerton teaches an ultrawide bandwidth communication system and method (column 2, lines 10-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lockridge et al. to include utilizing an ultrawide bandwidth transceiver as in Fullerton because it would provide with an improved system wherein an impulse radio link can communicate many independent channels simultaneously by employing different subcarriers for each channel (Fullerton, Abstract, lines 1-11).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments, with regards to claims 1, 10, 19, and 22, filed November 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. On pages 11-13 of the Applicant's Response, Applicants argue that Lockridge fails to disclose the amended "each of the plurality of global synchronizing events being associated with one of a plurality of a different global synchronizing event identifiers," and that "[t]here is nothing in Lockridge that discloses that each transmission of SCR information be associated with a different identifier."

14. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because Lockridge does provide for the embodiment of its "time stamping features" in "certain wireless networks, for example IEEE 802.11b" (page 16, lines 29-31). Even though Lockridge fails to explicitly disclose the details, when using the industry standard specification for this particular embodiment, the transmitter's id (i.e. global synchronizing event identifier) is associated with every beacon (i.e. global synchronizing event). Insofar as the above-mentioned arguments apply to amended claims 5 and 14, it is also taught by Lockridge on the same grounds. This reasoning has been developed further in the appropriate rejections above.

15. On pages 15-16 the Applicants argue that "it would be impermissible to characterize the system as being one large device."

16. The Examiner agrees with this argument. However, even if the specific elements cited are not combinable to anticipate the limitations of claim 22, it does not necessarily follow that Lockridge as a whole does not anticipate the limitations. The specified citations are intended to be representative, but the Applicant is reminded that the entire reference should be examined.

17. On page 16 the Applicants argue that "claim 22 recites more than just a wireless transceiver that receives first and second time stamps."

18. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because while it does recite a wireless transceiver which happens to perform a function, no evidence is provided in the disclosure indicating any functional distinction between a wireless transceiver capable of receiving an air link frame and a wireless transceiver capable of receiving an air link frame containing the particular data recited in the claim.

19. On pages 16-17 the Applicants argue that the first and second time stamp processors are indeed patentably distinct and further that "nothing in Lockridge shows anything regarding a latency value."

20. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because a single circuit embodying multiple claim elements does provide evidence that the elements may be anticipated by a single reference element which itself is capable of performing multiple functions. Furthermore, as above, even if the cited elements regarding the limitations do not, in the Applicant's opinion, provide evidence of anticipation this does not preclude its anticipation by the remainder of the reference.

21. In this particular example in response to arguments regarding claim 22, in an attempt to clarify matters, the Examiner points out that Lockridge does in fact teach the receiver device as being embodied exclusively in its "client device" as follows:

a free-running timer for providing a series of increasing free-running timing values (page 6, lines 21-23, the local counter);

a detection circuit for detecting a global synchronizing event and receiving a free-running timing value from the series of increasing free-running timing values (page 16, lines 29-31, in particular in 802.11b where the client (i.e. receiver device) is a station it must include a circuit for detecting a beacon frame which includes a timestamp);

a wireless transceiver for receiving an air link frame having a host interface packet and a first time stamp, the host interface packet including a second time stamp (page 13, lines 10-15 and Fig.6, element 602, since the network may be wireless as previously established it is inherent in the art that any client in the network must have a wireless transceiver and the packet received by the time stamp board may include both time stamps);

a first time stamp processor for receiving the first time stamp and comparing the first time stamp with a recorded free-running timing value to determine a timer correction value for the receiver device; (page 6, lines 21-23, the time stamp T2 being the first time stamp and the local counter being a free-running timing value);

a second time stamp processor for receiving the second time stamp and generating a host data process signal based on the second time stamp, the correction value, and a latency value, the latency value indicating an expected maximum latency time for the air link frame over the wireless channel (page 6, line 28 to page 7, line 11, where the "reasonable amount of jitter" is an expected maximum latency value, the "count value stored [in] memory" is the second time stamp, and the "counter is ... locked to the server clock" using the correction value); and

a host interface circuit for receiving and processing the host interface frame based on the host data process signal, and providing the host data to a local host circuit (Figure 6 and page 13, lines 13-20).

22. Therefore, in view of the above reasons, Examiner maintains rejections.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TRAVIS POGMORE whose telephone number is (571)270-7313. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Pham can be reached on 571-272-3689. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 4148

/THOMAS PHAM/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4148